A Prognostic Role of Perceived Parenting Styles in Mastery vs. Performance Goal Orientations among Students

Sarwat Sultan[1], Frasat Kanwal[2], Sumreen Kanwal[3]

Article History:	ABSTRACT
Received: 5 Jan, 2020 **Accepted:** 18 May, 2020	This study was purported to examine the role of perceived parenting styles in fostering the achievement goal orientations; mastery vs. performance among students. Participants of the study were 323 secondary school students aged 14-17 years old; 153 boys and 170 girls who provided their responses on Parenting Style Scale and Achievement Goals Scale. Results indicated that the students perceiving their parents with authoritative parenting style showed mastery goals for their academic achievements as compared to those students perceiving authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. Results postulated that gender of students combined with perception of parents is another predictive factor for differences in mastery and performances goals. Findings suggested significant main and interaction effects of gender and parenting styles on mastery-approach and avoidant goals but no interaction effect of gender and parenting style was found related to performance goals. ***Key Words:*** Achievement goals, mastery orientation, performance orientation, perceived parenting styles

1. Introduction

Parenting styles and achievement goals have always been a topic of great interest for the researchers and academics. Earlier studies gave us an understanding that achievement goals can explain that community surroundings of students can have an impact on their educational inspirations (Dinger et al., 2013), sentiments (Putwain, Sander, & Larkin, 2013), happiness (Tian, Yu, & Huebner, 2017) and performance (Diaconu-Gherasim & Măirean, 2016). But some researches from the past also focused on parental involvement that parents play conspicuous role to form their adolescents' motivational objectives (Grolnick & Ryan, 1989).

==
[1,2]Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan

[3]Physio College of Rehabilitation Sciences, Multan

Achievement goal orientation theory revolutionized the understanding of motivation in the start of 20th century. Goal orientation theory is a social-cognitive theory of achievement motivation. Although other motivational theories study students' beliefs about their successes and failures, goal orientation theory studies the causes why students engage in their academic work. Achievement goal orientation is actually a person's individual beliefs recognized to display their talents or the objectives set forth to be effective and successful (Ames, 1992). Pintrich (2000) explained it as one's self-concept about the causes for learning and concentrating on objectives to be successful.

Early goal theoreticians focused on two types of goals orientations: Mastery, which is a need to obtain added knowledge or learning new skills, and Performance, which is an aspiration to demonstrate high ability and make a good impression (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). When people are engaged in mastery goals they use their failure information to improve their capability however when they adopt performance aims this negative information about their failure indicates a lack of normative behavior (Elliot, 2005). Mastery and performance goals are opposite to each other, mastery goals are more adaptive in nature and associated with superior educational accomplishment, less anxiety, less depression and good health (Luo & Nie, 2011; Tian et al., 2017) whereas performance goals are linked with non-adaptive behavior like limited interest (Dweck & Leggett, 1988).

Recent works of goal theorists have integrated another aspect of goal orientation: approach and avoidance (Pintrich, 2000; Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Performance approach goals indicate standard competency and outpacing the competitors; performance avoidance goals represent to avoid being unintelligent and irresponsible as compared to others. Performance approach goals are positively correlated with academic results, educational learning, happiness, and positive feelings (Lau &Nie, 2008; Liem, Lau, & Nie, 2008; Tian et al., 2017). Performance avoidance goals have positive correlation with boredome, low academic achievement, high nervousness, and self-defeating behavior (Yeo, Loft, Xiao, & Kiewitz, 2009; Dinger et al., 2013; Luo et al., 2013).

Mastery approach goals involve enhancement of understanding and competencies, mastery avoidance goals cause struggling to avoid loss of expertise and potential or declining growth. Those who possess mastery avoidance goals are more anxious with themselves and their assignments and are obsessed with perfection (Pintrich, 2000; Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Mastery avoidance goals are also associated with dysfunctional results like damaging sentiments, fear for seeking help, low fundamental drive, and observed capability (Chiang, Yeh, Lin, & Hwang, 2011; Luo et al., 2013; Putwain et al., 2013). Some scholars identified that mastery avoidance goals were not linked to performance (Cury, Elliot, Da Fonseca, & Moller, 2006; Yeo et al., 2009), and other (Diaconu-Gherasim & Măirean, 2016) found that these goals were positively correlated with educational success. Generally, earlier researches confirmed that mastery avoidance goals predicted reduced amount of desirable results than mastery approach goals. Barron and Harackiewicz (2001) suggested that both mastery and performance goals are equally important for people to get the maximum advantage.

Researchers have speculated that there are connections between parenting styles and the effects of these styles on children, and these effects persist in adult behavior. Children start learning manners and basic skills from family. Parents use several approaches and actions in upbringing of their children according to their own personalities, social and emotional environment, and individualities and activities of their kids. These factors provide a base for specific parenting styles which plays a fundamental role in a child's academic and societal growth. Parenting style refers to the combination of strategies that parents use to raise their children (Kordi & Baharudin, 2010). In 1960, Baumrind identified three basic parental styles authoritative, authoritarian and permissive (Akca, 2012).

One of the three major styles identified by Baumrind was the authoritative style. These parents form rules and directions for their children to obey. This style is quite democratic and children with democratic parents are independent, socially confident and

extremely organized (Baumrind, 1991). Steinberg (2001) stated that democratic style is perfectly suitable for the upbringing of kids and especially for adults. Authoritative parents are reactive to their children and listen to their questions. These parents have a lot of expectations from their children, but they offer friendliness, feedback, and sufficient support. These parents inspire their children to be self- regulating though they control their children's activities as well. This sort of family environment makes children self-confident, imaginative, business persons and problem-solvers.

Authoritarian parents expect from their children that they will obey the rules strictly and when children are failed to follow, they are punished by parents. This style of parents is described as bossy and autocratic. These actions make disobedient adolescents more hostile and passive adults develop added dependency on their families (Baumrind, 1991). Authoritarian parents are emotionally disconnected and excessively controlling. They use power and directive methods, and are less inclined to utilize logical ways for control. The resulting adolescents from this type of upbringing lack sociability because their parents do not encourage them to be independent (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). These adults have worse social skills, low self-respect and less confidence as compared to authoritative parent's children (Martin & Nikos. 2006).

Permissive parents give tremendous freedom to their children and can never say no to them and spoil them by fulfilling all their wishes. As a result, their children show less self-control and become more self-centered (Baumrind, 1991). This lenient attitude of permissive parents creates difficulties for their children to fit in the social relations outside their family. Children and adults from permissive families cannot face hostile peer pressure (Steinberg, Darling, & Fletcher 1994), show challenging behavior, damaging lifespan outcomes and low academic performance (Lamborn et al., 1991).

Parenting styles and children's behaviors are closely related which lead to different outcomes in the children's lives. Mostly, authoritative parenting is positively

related with mastery goals whereas, authoritarian and permissiveness are positively linked to performance goals (Gurland & Grolnick, 2005; Duchesne & Ratelle, 2010). But some researches have varied results about the relationship between parenting type and achievement objectives, mainly mastery avoidance and performance approach goals. For example, parental participation, independence, care and discipline are positively connected to performance approach goals (Kim, Schallert, & Kim, 2010; Luo et al., 2013). Maternal involvement is negatively associated with performance approach goals (Duchesne & Ratelle, 2010) and parental support and performance approach goals have no relation at all (Diaconu-Gherasim & Măirean, 2016).

Moreover, there are diversified results about the relationship between parenting and mastery avoidance goals. Luo et al. (2013) observed that parental discipline was positively correlated with mastery avoidance goals whereas parental involvement was not connected with the same goals. According to Diaconu-Gherasim and Măirean (2016), parental independence has a positive whereas parental rejection has a negative relation with mastery avoidance goals. Adolescents with mastery avoidance approach have a strong need for perfection and to avoid mistakes therefore, there are positive links between parental autonomy orientation and their psychological intrusiveness with their kid's perfectionism (Pintrich, 2000; Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Gong et al., 2016). A Hong Kong research study in school environment also provided evidences for a strong positive relationship between perceived parenting styles and achievement goals. Significant differences were found in relation to gender, like in males, a strong positive correlation was found between authoritarian style and performance goals whereas in females a positive relationship existed between authoritative parenting and mastery goals (Ames, 1992).

Cohan and Rice (1997) studied 386 pairs of 8 to 9 grade students as well as their 26 to 45 years age parents and their authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and combined child raising ways, and found strong connections between parenting and achievement of their child. Student's perception about their parents was more authoritarian, less authoritative and less permissive than their parents thought of themselves. Student's

success in school was positively correlated with the perception of high authoritativeness, low authoritarianism and low permissiveness. Several researches are conducted in past in context of parenting and achievement goals in the world (Lamborn, et al., 1991; Gonzalez, Greenwood & WenHsu 2001; Mahasneh, 2014) but in Pakistan no research work is properly done on these variables. That is why it is expected that this research study will serve a great contribution in the field of developmental psychology.

Research findings have maintained that students' perception of parenting styles determine the mastery and performance achievement goals orientation among students (Pintrich, 2000). Based on the review of this literature, the current study further examined the impact of perceived parenting styles on four types of achievement goals among students in relation to the gender differences as well. The present research is an extension to uncovered the role of parenting styles in determining the way a student choose to set his/her achievement goals in academic pursuits. Gender effect combined with parenting styles was also another objective of the current study.

2. Methodology

2.1 Participants

The sample consisted of 323 secondary school students ranging in age between 14 and 17 years (mean=15.21, SD=1.79). This sample of students was approached from six schools of multan city through random sampling technique. Participants were further divided into gender; 153 boys and 170 girls studying in grades 9 and 10. All the participants were contacted at their school during study time through convenient sampling technique.

2.2 Instruments

The following instruments were used to achieve the objectives of the present study.

2.2.1 Parenting Style Scale

Parenting Style Scale (Powel& Dillon 1998) was used to measure the three perceived parenting styles; Authoritarian, Authoritative, and Permissive. It is a11-items scale responding on a 3-point Likert response options. Scores on each style was obtained separately. For Authoritarian style, one score for every (a) response on items 1 to 5 and one score for every (b) response on items 6 to 11 were added. For Authoritative Style, one point for every (b) response is added on items 1 to 5 and one score for every (b) response on 6 to 11 items were given. Similarly, for Permissive Style, one score for every (c) response on items1 to 5 and one score for every (c) response were added on 6 to 11 items. The range of the total scores on each of the parenting style from lowest to highest was 0-11. The highest score indicated the dominant parenting style. Alpha reliability coefficient of the score was found .79. Alpha reliability coefficient for each parenting style was found as .81 for authoritarian style, .79 for authoritative style, and .83 for permissive style.

2.2.2   Achievement Goal Scale

Achievement Goal Scale (Elliot & McGregor, 1999) was used to measure the types of achievement goals; mastery and performance goals with two sub components of approach and avoidance. It is a 12-items questionnaire responding on a 7-pointLikertscale indicating 1 (not at all true of me) to 7 (very true of me). Three items were composed for each of the four achievement goal orientations. A total score on each of goal orientations was obtained by averaging the scores provided on three items on each type of orientation; mastery-approach goal (3, 7 and 11), mastery-avoidance goal (2, 6 and 10), performance-approach goal (1, 5 and 9), and performance-avoidance goal (4, 8 and 12). Scores for each type of achievement goals was found between 3 and 21. The highest score shows the dominant type of achievement goal. Alpha reliability coefficients for each of the goal orientations were found between .83 and .92.

2.3 Procedure

Prior to data collection, the institutional permission was taken first from the school principals. All the students were then approached during their school hours in their classes with the presence of their teachers. After briefing them the purpose of the present study, they were assured that their responses on the questionnaires will be kept confidential and will only be used for research purpose. All the students responded on two scales measuring parenting styles and achievement goals along with a demographic information sheet; gender, age, class, parents' education, and parents' employment. School students were then categorized into three groups in respect of their parenting styles (authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive) according to their highest score received on any one of three parenting styles. Data were analyzed by using SPSS-21.

3. Results

Mean and standard deviation for descriptive analyses of the rating on perceived parenting styles and achievement goals were calculated to identify the types of parenting styles and achievement goals respectively (Table 1). One-way Analyses of Variance along with post-hoc tests were computed to see the differences in the achievement goals among students of authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting styles (Table 2). Two-way ANOVA were employed to see the combined effects of gender and parenting styles on four types of achievement goals (Table 3).

Table 1

Means and standard deviations of the scores for four types of achievement goals among students of three parenting styles.

		Mastery Goals		Performance Goals	
Parenting Styles		Mastery Approach	Mastery Avoidant	Performance Approach	Performance Avoidant
Authoritarian	**M**	11.46	14.73	17.69	19.06
	SD	3.81	3.07	2.06	2.91
Authoritative	**M**	17.91	15.62	12.04	10.44
	SD	2.07	3.29	3.85	3.26
Permissive	**M**	14.00	12.00	15.00	14.50
	SD	2.83	4.24	3.31	3.68

Table 1 indicates the differences among students who were identified with their perceived parenting styles of authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive practices. Statistics shows that mean scores of mastery-approach and avoidant goals are higher for authoritative parenting style. While the scores on authoritarian and permissive parenting styles are found higher on performance-approach and avoidant goals.

Table 2

One Way Analysis of Variance of Students' Perceived Parenting Styles for their Scores on four Achievement Goals.

Scales	Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	P
Mastery Approach	Between Groups	331.38	2	701.37	2.644	.00**
	Within Groups	42327.55	297	627.88		
	Total	43549.44	299			
Mastery Avoidant	Between Groups	383.17	2	613.63	1.997	.04*
	Within Groups	44132.12	297	515.05		
	Total	45345.16	299			
Performance Approach	Between Groups	4541.58	2	836.32	2.739	.00**
	Within Groups	143565.11	297	245.82		
	Total	165413.79	299			

Performance Avoidant	Between Groups	4034.04	2	615.03	2.339	.04*
	Within Groups	156307.09	297	375.58		
	Total	115453.13	299			

*p< 0.05, **p< 0.01

The results of One-Way Analysis of Variance in Table 2 indicate significant differences in the scores of students on four types of achievement goals as a function of different parenting styles. Results imply that the students under different parenting practices hold different types of mastery and performance goals for their studies.

The analysis of post hoc Tukey-Test showed significant differences in the mean scores of students of authoritative parenting style from authoritarian parenting (3.37, p = .012) and permissive parenting (4.67, p = .027) on mastery-approach goals. Results suggested that students under authoritative parenting had higher mastery-approach goals as compared to the both other parenting styles. Results further showed mean differences of authoritative parenting from authoritarian parenting (5.83, p = .014) and from permissive parenting (4.04, p = .008) on mastery-avoidant goals. Results suggested that students of authoritative parenting were higher on mastery avoidant goals than other two parenting styles.

Table 3

Two Way ANOVA of Students' 2(Gender) × 3(Parenting Styles) for their Scores on Achievement Goals.

Scale	Source Main Effect	SS	MS	df	F	P
	Gender	4.865	4.826	1	4.14	.002**
Mastery-Approach	Parenting Styles	3.616	3.662	1	2.54	.03*
	Interaction	3.564	2.764	1	2.35	.01*

	Gender * Parenting Styles					
	Error	464.91	1.165<-	29 7		
	Total	466.56		29 9		
Mastery-Avoidant	Gender	4.633	3.366	1	5.65	.003**
	Parenting Styles	3.166	2.467	1	2.60	.03*
	Interaction Gender * Parenting Styles	3.502	3.505	1	3.06	.001**
	Error	458.16	115.78<-	29 7		
	Total	471.09		29 9		
Performance-Approach	Gender	1.322	0.331	1	6.65	.12ns
	Parenting Styles	3.356	3.416	1	3.14	.04*
	Interaction Gender * Parenting Styles	0.505	1.504	1	0.02	.86ns
	Error	46754.16	154.78<-	29 7		
	Total	41768.02		29 9		
Performance-Avoidant	Gender	4.234	4.352	1	5.46	.01*
	Parenting Styles	4.345	3.354	1	5.23	.04*
	Interaction Gender * Parenting Styles	1.739	0.739	1	0.66	.32ns
	Error	308946.93	275.11<-	29 7		
	Total	409221.24		29 9		

** $p \leq 0.01$

Results in Table 3 indicate the significant direct effects of gender and parenting styles on mastery-approach and mastery-avoidant goals; and therefore, interaction effects of gender and parenting styles on mastery-approach and avoidant have also been observed. Results further indicate that gender has no significant direct impact on performance approach; therefore, no interaction effect with parenting styles was found. Hence the findings show the main effects of gender and parenting styles on performance-avoidant goal but both have no interaction effect for performance-avoidant goal.

4. Discussion

Parental practices used by parents in dealing with their children have always been found fundamental in their children's social, cognitive, and academic development as well as in shaping their behavior at early ages. Parents attitudes and behaviors what they adopt usually called as parenting style that further has an effect on self-development, self-efficacy, self-esteem, academic motivation and achievement (Brown & Iyengar, 2008). Another concept related to student achievement is achievement goal orientation. The perspective of achievement goal orientation elaborates the reasons of one's involvement in learning tasks and their goals in terms of personal achievement (Middleton & Midgley, 1997).

In this study we examined the differences in achievement goals among the students having different perceived parenting styles i.e. authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. The study was also intended to find out gender differences in perceived parenting styles and achievement goals among students. The first hypothesis of the study stated that the students having perceived authoritative parenting styles have more mastery-approach and avoidant goals then the students having perceived authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. Results demonstrated that there was a critical distinction among students having different perceived parenting styles. Results (Table 1) proved that the students having perceived authoritative parenting styles have more mastery goals (M=17.91, SD=2.07) as compared to the students having perceived authoritarian (M=11.46, SD=3.81) and permissive parenting (M=14.00, SD=2.83) styles.

These findings are in accordance with the work of Juang and Silbereisen (1999) who examined the interplay between parenting styles and patterns of aspiration among students. They identified the link between parenting and students' type of aspiration which

further anticipated the grades in class and other academic benefits. They suggested from their research conducted on 640 students that the adolescents perceiving their parents more warmth, engaged in healthy interactions, and rich discussions on academic related issues with them (authoritative style) had mastery goals and showed higher school engagement and involvement.

The interest of this study was basically to know the differences in students' choice of mastery-approach and avoidant goal orientation, and performance-approach and avoidant goal orientation in relation to their perception of parent dealings with them. Findings depicted that mean scores of mastery-approach and avoidant goals were higher for authoritative parenting style. While the scores on authoritarian and permissive parenting styles were found higher on performance-approach and avoidant goals.

These findings are in line with the research findings of Mital (2011) who conducted a research to analyze the impact of three maternal parenting styles; authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive on achievement goals; mastery/performance-approach and avoidance, school grades, and school involvement among students. Findings indicated that students perceiving their mothers under authoritative parenting style were found more likely to learn under mastery goals and obtained high grades. Moreover, the students who identified their mothers more authoritarian and permissive attained lower GPAs and reported performance goal orientations. Finally, study provided the notion that authoritative parenting style is more significant in learning skills and raising school engagement through the adoption of mastery goals during student life. Leung, Lau and Lam (1998) also studied the association between child rearing styles and achievement goals in United States and found the similar findings about authoritativeness and achievement goals.

As the current study was also focused on examining the effects of gender combined with differences in perception of parents, the data were further analyzed to test this hypothesis. Results (Table 3) indicated the significant main effects of gender (F=5.65, p=.003) and parenting styles (F=2.60, p=.03). on mastery-approach and avoidant goals which implied that students' gender individually is a function of determining the mastery goal orientations. Male and female students' perception of parenting styles was also found a significant factor for students' selection of goal orientations. Thus interaction effects of gender and parenting styles on mastery-approach (F=2.35, p=.01) and avoidant (F=3.06, p=.001) have also been observed Gollowitzer(1996) documentation that a boy or girl perception about their parents was strongly associated with grades had provided a great strength to the present study findings.

Results further indicated that gender has no significant main and interaction effect on performance approach. Though main effects of gender and parenting styles have been found on performance-avoidant goal but both have no interaction effect for performance-avoidant goal. It is quite noticeable in this regard that many of the previous studies conducted on goal orientations were related to men samples and perspectives surely may have been changed since then. Boys' and girls' equal participation in any academic field has developed a comparable similarity of endorsing achievement goals between both genders and therefore the result is no gender differences in terms of achievement goals. Further it might be due to the recent advancement in gender-role socialization for males and females that may lead to develop consistent patterns of achievement goals they signify and adopt.

Results further showed that gender has no main and combined impact on performance approach. In spite of the fact that main impacts of gender and parenting styles

have been found on performance-avoidant goals however both have no connection impact for performance-avoidant goal. This may have been recognized that a great part of the early studies on goal orientations was directed with men only. At present, things may have change since that time. Male and female students have been found equal in the orientation of performance goals. Reasons can be grounded that now female students perceiving authoritative parenting style are working hard to attain competencies in their learning areas and therefore are less inclined to set performance goals.

Conclusion

This study has been found booming in providing the evidence that students' perception of parenting styles is a significant component for determining the patterns of achievement goals among students. Students perceiving authoritative parenting style have been found with mastery goal orientations than the students of authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. Male and female students perceiving different parenting styles had no impact on performance goals among students.

Limitations and Suggestions

As the study relied on conveniently approached sample and the findings cannot be generalized to the whole kind of student population, it is suggested that the random sampling should be done for more reliable results and its generalizing capacity. The study may well be replicated with more variables associated with parenting styles and goal orientations e.g. parents' education level, income, and living area.

The findings of the present study have the implications for students, teachers, and parents. This study will be helpful for the students to have an insight into their own goals

of hard working, their basic motivation and intention for study. For parents, it provides statistical evidence that their children' perceptions towards their parenting practices and their behavior towards their children ultimately determine their children' motivation and type of achievement goals. It must be in benefit to the student if parents are given awareness regarding the most adaptive types of parenting behaviors. For the teachers, study will help them understand aspects of learning motives of the students regarding their study strategies. Teachers can get benefit in understanding students' behavior in the context of their perceived parenting styles, and then can guide parents as well in parents' meetings.

References

Ames, C. (1992). Achievement goals and the classroom motivational climate. *Student perceptions in the classroom*, (pp.327-348). Hillsdale, New Jersey, Lawrence Eribaum Associates Publishers.

Akca, R. P, (2012). Ana- BabalarınÇocukYetiştirmedeAşırıKoruyucuOlmaları. AkademikBakışDergisi, *29*: 1-13.

Barron, K. E., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2001). Achievement goals and optimal motivation: testing multiple goal models. *Journal of Personality and Social. Psychology.* 80, 706–722. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.80.5.706

Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use.*The Journal of Early Adolescence, 11*(1), 56-95.

Brown, L., & Lyengar, S. (2008). Parenting Styles: The Impact on Student Achievement. *Marriage & Family Review,43*(1):14-38. DOI 10.1080/01494920802010140

Chiang, Y.-T., Yeh, Y.-C., Lin, S. S. J., & Hwang, F.-M. (2011). Factor structure and predictive utility of the 2 x 2 achievement goal model in a sample of Taiwan students. *Learning and Individual Differences. 21*, 432–437. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2011.02.011

Cohen, D. A., & Rice, J. (1997). Parenting styles, adolescent substance use, and academic achievement. *Journal of Drug Education, 27*(2), 199-211.

Cury, F., Elliot, A. J., Da Fonseca, D., & Moller, A. C. (2006). The social-cognitive model of achievement motivation and the 2x2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 90*, 666–679. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.4.666

Diaconu-Gherasim, L. R., & Măirean, C. (2016). Perception of parenting styles and academic achievement: the mediating role of goal orientations. *Learning and Individual Differences. 49*, 378–385. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2016.06.026

Dinger, F. C., Dickhaeuser, O., Spinath, B., & Steinmayr, R. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of students' achievement goals: a mediation analysis. *Learning and Individual Differences. 28*, 90–101. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2013.09.005

Duchesne, S., &Ratelle, C. (2010). Parental behaviors and adolescents' achievement goals at the beginning of middle school: emotional problems as potential mediators. *Journal of Educational Psychology. 102,* 497–507. doi: 10.1037/a0019320

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review. 95*, 256–273. doi: 10.1037//0033-295x.95.2.256

Elliot, A. J. (2005). "A conceptual history of the achievement goal construct," in *Handbook of Competence and Motivation*, eds A. J. Elliot and C. S. Dweck (New Nork, NY: The Guilford Press), 52–72.

Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (1999). Test anxiety and the hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 628-644.

Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. (2001). A 2 X 2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80,* 501-519. doi:10.1037///0022-3514.80.3.501

Gollowitzer, P. (1996). The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior. New York: Guilford.

Gong, X., Paulson, S. E., & Wang, C. (2016). Exploring family origins of perfectionism: the impact of interparental conflict and parenting behaviors. *Personality and Individual. Differences, 100,* 43–48. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2016.02.010

Gonzalez, A., Greenwood, G., & WenHsu, J.(2001). Undergraduate students' goal orientations and their relationship to perceived parenting styles. College Student Journal 35(2): 182-193.
doi:10.5897/ERR2014.1789.

Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Parent styles associated with children's self-regulation and competence in school. *Journal of Educational Psychology. 81,* 143–154. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.81.2.143

Gurland, S. T., and Grolnick, W. S. (2005). Perceived threat, controlling parenting, and children's achievement orientations. *Motivation and Emotion. 29,* 103–121. doi: 10.1007/s11031-005-7956-2

Juang, L. P., &Silbereisen, R. K. (1999). Supportive parenting over time in former East and West Germany. *Journal of Adolescence, 22,* 719–736.

Kim, J.-I., Schallert, D. L., & Kim, M. (2010). An integrative cultural view of achievement motivation: parental and classroom predictors of children's goal orientations when learning mathematics in Korea. *Journal of Educational Psychology. 102,* 418–437. doi: 10.1037/a0018676

Kordi, A., & Baharudin, R., (2010). Parenting Attitude and Style and Its Effect on Children's School Achievements. *International Journal of Psychological Studies (2)*2: 217-222.

Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustmentamong adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful families. *Child Development. 62*: 1049-1065.

Lau, S., & Nie, Y. (2008). Interplay between personal goals and classroom goal structures in predicting student outcomes: a multilevel analysis of person-context interactions. *Journal of Educational Psychology. 100,* 15–29. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.100.1.15

Leung, K. Lau, S. & Lam, W. L., (1998). Parenting styles and academic achievement: A cross cultural study. *Marrill-Parlmer Quarterly*, *44,* 157-172.

Liem, A. D., Lau, S., & Nie, Y. (2008). The role of self-efficacy, task value, and achievement goals in predicting learning strategies, task disengagement, peer relationship, and achievement outcome. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 33,* 486–512. doi: 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2007.08.001

Luo, W., Aye, K. M., Hogan, D., Kaur, B., & Chan, M. C. Y. (2013). Parenting behaviors and learning of Singapore students: the mediational role of achievement goals. *Motivation and Emotion, 37,* 274–285. doi: 10.1007/s11031-012-9303-8

Mahasneh, A. M. (2014). Investigation the relationship between goal orientation and parenting styles among sample of Jordanian university students. *Educational Research and Reviews 9*(11): 320-325.doi:10.5897/ERR2014.1789.

Martin, S. H., & Nikos L.D. C. (2006). Intrinsic motivation and self- determination in exercise and sport. *Learning and Individual Differences, 16*(2), 93-99.

Middleton, M, & Midgley, C. (1997). Avoiding the demonstration of lack of ability: An underexplored aspect of goal orientation. *Journal Educational Psychology,89,* 710-718. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.89.4.710.

Pintrich, P. R. (2000). An achievement goal theory perspective on issues in motivation terminology, theory, and research. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25,* 92-104.

Powel, J., & Dillon, P. (1998). Assessing Perception of Parents; Authoritarian, Authoritative, Permissive. Parenting style as context: *An integrative model,* New York: Guilford.

Putwain, D. W., Sander, P., & Larkin, D. (2013). Using the 2 x 2 framework of achievement goals to predict achievement emotions and academic performance. *Learning and Individual Differences. 25,* 80–84. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2013.01.006

Steinberg L, (2001). We know some things: parent-adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 11*(1),1-19.

Steinberg, L., Darling, N., & Fletcher, A. C. (1992 -94).P. Moen, G. H. Elder, Jr., & K. Luscher (Eds.), Authoritative parenting and adolescent adjustment: An ecological journey. *Examining lives in context: Perspectives on the ecology of human development* (pp. 423-466). Washington, DC: American Psychological Assn.

Tian, L., Yu, T., & Huebner, E. S. (2017). Achievement goal orientations and adolescents' subjective well-being in school: the mediating roles of academic social comparison directions. *Front. Psychology, 8:*37. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00037

Yeo, G., Loft, S., Xiao, T., & Kiewitz, C. (2009). Goal orientations and performance: Differential relationships across levels of analysis and as a function of task demands. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94,* 710–726. doi: 10.1037/a0015044